

U. S. Appln. No. 09/762,981  
Amendment dated November 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004

Page 8

### REMARKS

#### Priority

The Examiner has noted that a certified copy of the European priority application has not been filed. We are investigating the status of the priority application and, if necessary, we will order a certified copy of the European priority application from the European Patent Office.

#### Oath/Declaration

The Examiner has requested a new oath because the original oath is defective. The assignees of the present application are currently contacting the Applicants, who are no longer in the employ of the assignees, to execute new oaths and will provide same to the Examiner as soon as they are obtained from the Applicants.

#### Specification

The title stands objected to as being not descriptive. The title has been amended herein to address this deficiency.

#### Objections to the drawings

The drawings are indicated as acceptable subject to correction as indicated on the draftsman's review notice. New drawings are enclosed herewith.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C §102

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,589,067 to Porter et al. In particular, the Examiner finds that, with regard to claim 1, Porter discloses all of the claimed limitations. We have reviewed the reference with care, paying particular attention to the passages cited, and are compelled to respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference. Claim 1 is directed

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U. S. Appln. No. 09/762,981

Amendment dated November 29, 2004

Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004

Page 9

to a computer system having first and second processors wherein the second processor consumes instructions derived from the first processor through a decoupling element. In the system of Porter, on the other hand, the floating point vector processor (i.e. the second processor) does not consume instructions derived from the host computer (i.e. the first processor). Porter describes three modes of operation of the system 10 (i.e. the second processor): a tightly-coupled mode, a loosely-coupled mode, and an uncoupled mode. In the tightly-coupled mode the vector processor 10 is interfaced to the host computer and "software, resident in the host, controls system data acquisition, function evaluation in the pipeline and output data writes to the host". In the loosely-coupled mode the vector processor downloads and then operates on data received through I/O ports. In the stand-alone mode software resident internally in the vector processor is used for function evaluation and data input/output. Thus, the different coupling modes differ solely in the manner by which software become available to the vector processor (and hence how it is accessed by the master processing unit 12 of the vector processor). Once this software is made available, the function of the vector processor with respect to the host computer is the same (col. 4, l. 54-) and it consists of performing "computationally intensive functions" on data received from the host computer. Thus, the vector processor does not receive instructions from the host computer but rather only receives data upon which it performs preprogrammed algorithms or functions. We thus respectfully submit that Porter does not in fact anticipate claim 1, and request that the Examiner kindly withdraw this rejection.

Claims 3-10, 12-15 and 17 depend from claim 1. In view of the above discussion, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable, and for this reason claims 3-10, 12-15 and 17 are also allowable.

Claim 18 is a method claim that corresponds to apparatus claim 1 and that includes the step of passing instructions to a second processor for executing a task. As elaborated upon above, this is a different method of operating than that disclosed by Porter, wherein only data (not instructions) is passed to the vector processor for processing thereof. Thus, we submit that this claim is also novel and allowable over Porter.

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to correct an antecedent basis problem and a grammar problem, respectively. These amendments are made solely for the purpose of clarifying

U. S. Appln. No. 09/762,981  
Amendment dated November 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004

Page 10

the claims and are not made for purposes related to patentability, because the amendments do not alter the scope of the claims but rather merely clarify it.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 6, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,237,079 to Stoney or the Hennessy article. Claims 2, 6, 11 and 16 depend from claim 1. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, in light of the above discussion of claim 1, we submit that claims 2, 6, 11 and 16 are also allowable.

In view of the above, we submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 872-9306) on

November 29, 2004

(Date of Transmission)

Robert Popa

(Name of Person Transmitting)




(Signature)

November 29, 2004

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,010  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300 voice  
(323) 934-0202 facsimile  
rpopa@ladasparry.com

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**